Reexamination of Tolman's law and the Gibbs adsorption equation for curved interfaces

Martin Thomas Horsch,[1,2,a)] Stefan Becker,[2] Michaela Heier,[2] Jayant Kumar Singh,[1] Felix Diewald,[3] Ralf Müller,[3] George Jackson,[4] Jadran Vrabec,[5] and Hans Hasse[2]

[1)] *Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Department of Chemical Engineering, Kalyanpur, UP 208016, India*

[2)] *University of Kaiserslautern, Laboratory of Engineering Thermodynamics, Erwin-Schrödinger Str. 44, 67663 Kaiserslautern, Germany*

[3)] *University of Kaiserslautern, Institute of Applied Mechanics, Erwin-Schrödinger Str. 44, 67663 Kaiserslautern, Germany*

[4)] *Imperial College London, Department of Chemical Engineering, South Kensington Campus, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom*

[5)] *University of Paderborn, Thermodynamics and Energy Technology, Warburger Str. 100, 33098 Paderborn, Germany*

(Dated: 28th March 2017)

The influence of the surface curvature $1/R$ on the surface tension γ of small droplets in equilibrium with a surrounding vapour, or small bubbles in equilibrium with a surrounding liquid, can be expanded as $\gamma(R) = \gamma_0 + c_1\gamma_0/R + \mathcal{O}\left(1/R^2\right)$, where $R = R_\gamma$ is the radius of the surface of tension, and γ_0 is the surface tension of the planar interface corresponding to zero curvature. According to Tolman's law, the first-order coefficient $c_1 = -2\delta_0$ in this expansion is obtained from the planar limit δ_0 of the Tolman length, i.e., the difference $\delta = R_\rho - R_\gamma$ between the equimolar radius R_ρ and R_γ. We show here that the deduction of Tolman's law from interfacial thermodynamics relies on an inaccurate application of the Gibbs adsorption equation to dispersed phases (droplets or bubbles). A revision of the underlying theory reveals that the adsorption equation needs to be employed in an alternative manner to that suggested by Tolman. Accordingly, we develop a generalized Gibbs adsorption equation which consistently takes the size dependence of interfacial properties into account, and show that from this equation, a relation between δ and the influence of the size of the dispersed phase on γ cannot be deduced, invalidating the argument which was put forward by Tolman [J. Chem. Phys. 17 (1949) 333].

Keywords: Surface tension, nanodroplets, nucleation theory, Tolman length, thermodynamics of small systems

arXiv:1703.08719v1 [cond-mat.soft] 25 Mar 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

The surface tension of small droplets or bubbles at the nanometre length scale has a significant influence on the formation of dispersed phases by homogeneous nucleation.[1–4] It is also crucial to understand droplet or bubble growth, decay, coalescence, and the coupling between heat and mass transfer at curved interfaces.[4–7]

The capillarity approximation is commonly employed: The surface tension γ of a nanodroplet is assumed to be identical with the value γ_0 that is attained in the limit of zero curvature, i.e., infinite droplet radius, or for a macroscopic planar interface. This approximation has the advantage that γ_0 is experimentally measurable, while the actual value of γ is unknown for nanodispersed phases.

However, the capillarity approximation leads to a paradox when the Laplace equation

$$p'(\mu, T) - p''(\mu, T) = \frac{2\gamma}{R_\gamma} \tag{1}$$

is applied to extremely small droplets. This equation characterizes the difference between the pressure p' in a dispersed phase (e.g., the droplet) and p'' in the surrounding phase (e.g., the vapour) in terms of the Laplace radius R_γ, which is also referred to as the radius of the surface of tension. In the case of a constant value of γ, the pressure difference would have to become infinite as $R_\gamma \to 0$.

For molecular fluids, this is unphysical. On extending the equation of state into the metastable region (for the surrounding phase), under the boundary conditions of equal chemical potential $\mu' = \mu''$ and temperature $T' = T''$, a maximum is obtained for the pressure difference that can be established at a curved interface for a given temperature. This maximum pressure difference is reached at the spinodal boundary for the phase that surrounds the nanodispersed phase, as shown in Fig. 1 which contains a μ–p diagram for the Lennard-Jones truncated and shifted (LJTS) fluid. At the spinodal, corresponding to the circles in Fig. 1, the surrounding phase becomes unstable.[2,8,9]

As a consequence, there is either a minimal value for the radius R_γ such that no droplets with a smaller radius can form in thermodynamic equilibrium, or the surface tension tends to zero $\gamma \to 0$ (as $R_\gamma \to 0$) in the limit of spinodal conditions for the surrounding phase, such that

[a)] Corresponding author. E-mail: martin@iitk.ac.in; phone: +91 512 259 6190.



Figure 1. Chemical potential as a function of pressure for the LJTS fluid with the cutoff radius $r_c = 2.5\ \sigma$ for the isotherms $T = 0.75\ \varepsilon/k$ (continuous curve) and $T = 0.9\ \varepsilon/k$ (dashed curve), obtained from fifth-order virial expansions correlated to molecular simulation results.[10] The square denotes vapour-liquid coexistence conditions for the planar interface, and the circles denote the vapour spinodal (top) and the liquid spinodal (bottom) for the $T = 0.75\ \varepsilon/k$ isotherm. The region between the two horizontal lines corresponds to vapour-liquid coexistence conditions for curved interfaces; for values of μ greater than that of the vapour phase at the spinodal, or smaller than that of the liquid phase at the spinodal, only a single fluid phase can exist. Here, σ and ε are the size and energy parameters of the pair potential, the chemical potential is given in units of ε, and the pressure is given in units of ε/σ^3.

the ratio γ/R_γ remains finite. In some cases, there may be a minimal radius for stable droplets.[11] In general, γ depends on R_γ, and both for droplets and for bubbles it is therefore important to understand the behaviour of $\gamma(R_\gamma)$. The consensus seems to be that $\gamma \to 0$ for $R_\gamma \to 0$.[12]

This was also suggested by Tolman in a posthumous article,[13] submitted for publication by Kirkwood and Buff together with their own comment[14] on Tolman's work from the point of view of statistical mechanics, which supported Tolman's conclusions. The expression[13]

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma_0} = \frac{1}{1+2\delta/R_\gamma} + \mathcal{O}\left(\left[\frac{\delta}{R_\gamma}\right]^2\right) = 1 - \frac{2\delta}{R_\gamma} + \mathcal{O}\left(\left[\frac{\delta}{R_\gamma}\right]^2\right), \tag{2}$$

is known as Tolman's law, where the higher-order terms are typically neglected. This relation is frequently employed to describe the influence of the surface curvature on the surface tension. The Tolman length δ is introduced in Eq. (2) as a characteristic length scale. The value of δ does not, however, have to be constant; it can depend on the radius itself.[13,15,16] The value of δ to be used in Eq. (2) is that for the planar limit $\delta_0 = \lim_{R_\gamma\to\infty}\delta(R_\gamma)$ of the Tolman length, since the point of reference, around which γ/γ_0 is expanded in Eq. (2), is an interface with zero curvature, i.e., $1/R_\gamma = 0$.

Tolman[13] obtained Eq. (2) following a series of arguments based on the Gibbs adsorption equation[17,18] in the form

$$\zeta\,\mathrm{d}T + \mathrm{d}\gamma = -\Gamma\,\mathrm{d}\mu, \tag{3}$$

which relates a change in the surface tension to the specific surface excess entropy ζ, the adsorption Γ, and the chemical potential μ for a pure substance. In general, for a system containing ν components, $\Gamma\,\mathrm{d}\mu$ would have to be replaced by $\mathbf{\Gamma}\,\mathbf{d\mu} = \sum_{k=1}^{\nu}\Gamma_i\,\mathrm{d}\mu_i$, using vector notation to abbreviate the summation over components.

Tolman pointed out that even for a pure fluid ($\nu = 1$), an adsorption $\Gamma \neq 0$ can occur if the radius of the surface of tension R_γ deviates from the equimolar (Gibbs dividing) radius R_ρ, i.e. the radius that is defined from the condition $\Gamma = 0$. In order to quantify the excess of the equimolar radius over the radius of the surface tension, Tolman introduced the quantity[13]

$$\delta = R_\rho - R_\gamma, \tag{4}$$

which can be expressed in various ways which are equivalent if the validity of Tolman's law is assumed.[19–21] For pure fluids and spherical interfaces, the adsorption Γ and the radii R_γ and R_ρ are related by[13]

$$\frac{\Gamma}{\rho' - \rho''} = \delta\left[1 + \frac{\delta}{R_\gamma} + \frac{\delta^2}{3R_\gamma^2}\right]. \tag{5}$$

Eq. (5) is obtained by integrating over a spherical density profile, where ρ' and ρ'' are the densities of the coexisting phases; here and in the following discussion, the phase with the density ρ', the pressure p', etc., is the dispersed phase, and the phase with the density ρ'', the pressure p'', etc., is the surrounding phase. By combining Eqs. (1), (3), (5), and employing the Gibbs-Duhem equation,

$$(\mathrm{d}\mu)_T = \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}p'}{\rho'}\right)_T = \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}p''}{\rho''}\right)_T = \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}[p'-p'']}{\rho'-\rho''}\right)_T, \tag{6}$$

where the subscript indicates isothermal conditions, Tolman[13] obtained

$$\left(\frac{\partial\gamma}{\gamma\,\partial R_\gamma}\right)_T = \frac{2\delta}{R_\gamma^2}\left(1 + \frac{\delta}{R_\gamma} + \frac{\delta^2}{3R_\gamma^2}\right) \times \left[1 + \frac{2\delta}{R_\gamma^2}\left(1 + \frac{\delta}{R_\gamma} + \frac{\delta^2}{3R_\gamma^2}\right)\right]^{-1}, \tag{7}$$

an integrated version of which is given by Eq. (2). This result can be assessed from both an empirical and a theoretical point of view. Empirically, the size dependence of γ can be expressed as an expansion in the inverse radius

$$\frac{\gamma}{\gamma_0} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{c_k}{R_\gamma^k}, \tag{8}$$

at constant temperature; following Tolman's law, the Tolman length δ is seen to characterize the first-order coefficient

$$c_1 = \lim_{R_\gamma \to \infty} \frac{1}{\gamma_0} \left(\frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial (1/R_\gamma)} \right)_T = - \lim_{R_\gamma \to \infty} 2\delta. \qquad (9)$$

From the empirical point of view, it essentially does not matter how Tolman's law was derived, whether this derivation correctly reflects the underlying thermodynamics, and how the dependence $\gamma(R_\gamma)$ and the coefficient c_1 are related to other properties of the dispersed phase, such as its density profile.

In the recent literature, the first-order expression from Eq. (2) is increasingly regarded as empirically insufficient. It is consistently found that c_1 is very small for molecular fluids,[21–30] supporting Tolman[13] who suggested $\delta \approx 10^{-10}\,\mathrm{m}$. However, the sign of c_1 may be positive, which would contradict Tolman's expectation.[13] For atomic nuclei, a Tolman length of the order of $\delta \approx -10^{-15}\,\mathrm{m}$ was found.[31,32] In a series of excellent papers, Binder and collaborators[33–37] have repeatedly shown that the first-order contribution to γ in terms of the surface curvature is zero or very small, with the most relevant contribution coming from the second-order term. It has been argued that even if the contribution from c_1/R_γ increases γ slightly ($c_1 > 0$), it is eventually outweighed by a negative contribution proportional to $1/R_\gamma^3$, following Malijevský and Jackson,[12] or proportional to $1/R_\gamma^2$, following Ghoufi and Malfreyt,[38] from which the trend $\gamma \to 0$ for $R_\gamma \to 0$ is recovered.

From the empirical perspective, the main objection to Tolman's law essentially concerns the truncation of the infinite power series from Eq. (8) after the c_1/R_γ term. This truncation was introduced by Tolman[13] as an approximation and has therefore always been expected to break down, at least in the limit of extremely small droplets. The theoretical aspect of Tolman's law, which consists in ascribing a physical meaning to c_1, i.e.,

$$c_1 = -2\delta_0 = \lim_{R_\gamma \to \infty} 2(R_\gamma - R_\rho), \qquad (10)$$

has not come under strict criticism despite the known empirical shortcomings of the Tolman approach.

We show here that the theoretical interpretation of Tolman's law is not valid, because the derivation of the identity $c_1 = -2\delta_0$ is not consistent with interfacial thermodynamics. The basic reason is that the version of the Gibbs adsorption equation given by Eq. (3), on which Tolman's approach is based, strictly holds only for transitions which *do not alter the surface area*. Since changing the radius of a droplet also changes its surface area, it is incorrect to discuss the dependence of γ on R_γ on the basis of Eq. (3), and the theoretical basis of Tolman's law is put into question.

II. THEORY

A. Surface tension

A system with ν components and two coexisting fluid phases in thermodynamic equilibrium is considered here: The dispersed phase has the volume V' and the surrounding phase has the volume V''. Different topologies can be considered for the dispersed phase, which can be a spherical droplet (or bubble), i.e., the scenario considered by Tolman, but also, e.g., a planar thin film[39–41] or a cylinder.[34,42,43] The dispersed phase can be vapour (surrounded by liquid) or liquid (surrounded by vapour or another liquid phase). It is assumed that the topology does not change, i.e., the dispersed phase is either spherical in all cases, cylindrical in all cases, or planar in all cases.

Following the approach of Gibbs,[17] surface excess contributions are ascribed to the interface for all extensive thermodynamic properties. In this way, the Helmholtz free energy A of the system can be decomposed into

$$A = A' + A'' + A^\mathrm{E}, \qquad (11)$$

where A' is the Helmholtz free energy of a homogeneous fluid phase containing $\mathbf{N}'$ molecules in a volume V' and at a temperature T. Analogously, A'' is the free energy of a homogeneous fluid phase characterized by $\mathbf{N}''$, V'', and T. The surface excess term A^E describes the deviation of the Helmholtz free energy of the actual system, containing both phases and the interface, from the sum of the Helmholtz free energies of two homogeneous reference systems. Following Gibbs, the dividing surface is defined as a two-dimensional boundary which does not have a volume. Therefore, the overall volume is always

$$V = V' + V'', \qquad (12)$$

so that the excess volume is zero, $V^\mathrm{E} = 0$.

Thermodynamically, the surface tension γ can be defined as the partial derivative of the free energy with respect to the surface area f, for a variation that leaves all other thermodynamic properties of the coexisting phases constant, so that only the size of the surface area f changes.[43] In the case of the Helmholtz free energy

$$A = A(\mathbf{N}, V', V'', T, f), \qquad (13)$$

the total differential can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}A = &\sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial N_i}\right)_{N_{j\neq i},V',V'',T,f} \mathrm{d}N_i \\ &+ \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial V'}\right)_{\mathbf{N},V'',T,f} \mathrm{d}V' \\ &+ \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial V''}\right)_{\mathbf{N},V',T,f} \mathrm{d}V'' \\ &+ \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial T}\right)_{\mathbf{N},V',V'',f} \mathrm{d}T \\ &+ \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N},V',V'',T} \mathrm{d}f. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The surface tension corresponds to a variation of the Helmholtz free energy with the surface area at constant number of molecules $\mathbf{N}$ for all components, constant volume V' and V'' of the coexisting phases, and constant temperature T:

$$\gamma = \left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N},V',V'',T}. \tag{15}$$

The other partial derivatives yield the chemical potential of the components $\partial A/\partial N_i = \mu_i$, the pressure of the coexisting phases $\partial A/\partial V' = -p'$, $\partial A/\partial V'' = -p''$, and the entropy $\partial A/\partial T = -S$, from which Eq. (14) can be expressed as

$$\mathrm{d}A = \boldsymbol{\mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N} - p'\,\mathrm{d}V' - p''\,\mathrm{d}V'' - S\,\mathrm{d}T + \gamma\,\mathrm{d}f. \tag{16}$$

For discussions of curved interfaces, the radius R is often included as a variable, contributing to $\mathrm{d}A$ with the term $C\,\mathrm{d}R$. However, in the case of the radius of tension $R = R_\gamma$, the identity $C = 0$ can be deduced from the Laplace equation, cf. Eq. (1), eliminating this term.[17,44] Eq. (16) and subsequent equations are valid both for planar and curved interfaces.

This definition of γ is complicated by the fact that a thermodynamic system specified by the boundary conditions $\mathbf{N}$, V', V'', T, and f is actually overspecified, since strictly speaking, these quantities cannot be varied independently from each other. In particular, if $f(V')$ can be expressed as a function of V', e.g., for spherical dispersed phases where both f and V' are determined by R_γ, it is impossible to conduct a variation of f at constant V'. At thermodynamic equilibrium, for a system containing ν components, there are $\nu+2$ thermodynamic degrees of freedom, if extensive properties are counted, assuming that the topology of the system (e.g., containing a spherical droplet) is known. If $\nu+2$ quantities, e.g., $\mathbf{N}$, T, and f, are specified as boundary conditions, they determine all other properties of the system in thermodynamic equilibrium.

This raises a key question: How can Eqs. (13) to (16), which are based on the $\nu+4$ variables $\mathbf{N}$, V', V'', T, and f, be given a well-defined meaning thermodynamically? Various solutions to this problem have been offered. Following Hill,[44,45] Homman *et al.*[25] consider the total differential in terms of the variables $\mathbf{N}$, T, R_α, R_β, and R_γ, still corresponding $\nu+4$ variables. Two of these variables (R_α and R_β) are radii far from the interface, inside and outside the droplet;[25,46] in the case of nanodispersed phases, however, it is questionable whether there is a position inside the dispersed phase which is sufficiently far away from the interface. For planar interfaces, a notation similar to that of Hill[44,45] is developed by Marmur.[47] Rowlinson and Widom[18] use R_α and R_β as well as a conical angle ω to define the system, but subsequently replace these variables by f, V', and V''. Lau *et al.*[43] have recently introduced the concept of a transformation of the spatial metric, on the basis of which the test area method[48,49] was rederived in a mathematically rigorous way. By transforming the spatial metric, i.e., the definition of the intermolecular distances (and the surface area), the area f can be varied without changing $\mathbf{N}$, V', V'', or T, and without departing from thermodynamic equilibrium.[43] Furthermore, there are approaches which effectively assign a volume to the interface and thereby abandon, or generalize, interfacial thermodynamics following Gibbs,[17] such that Eq. (12) does not necessarily apply.[50]

A well-defined expression for γ which does not rely on a transformation of the spatial metric, and does not depart from interfacial thermodynamics following Gibbs, can be obtained by subtracting the total differentials for the two bulk phases ($\mathrm{d}A'$ and $\mathrm{d}A''$) from $\mathrm{d}A$.[18] Thereby, the total differential of the surface excess Helmholtz free energy is

$$\mathrm{d}A^\mathrm{E} = \mathrm{d}A - \mathrm{d}A' - \mathrm{d}A'' \tag{17}$$

where from Eq. (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}A &= \boldsymbol{\mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N} - p'\,\mathrm{d}V' - p''\,\mathrm{d}V'' - S\,\mathrm{d}T + \gamma\,\mathrm{d}f, \\ \mathrm{d}A' &= \boldsymbol{\mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N}' - p'\,\mathrm{d}V' - S'\,\mathrm{d}T, \\ \mathrm{d}A'' &= \boldsymbol{\mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N}'' - p''\,\mathrm{d}V'' - S''\,\mathrm{d}T, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

so that[18]

$$\mathrm{d}A^\mathrm{E} = \boldsymbol{\mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N}^\mathrm{E} - S^\mathrm{E}\,\mathrm{d}T + \gamma\,\mathrm{d}f, \tag{19}$$

wherein $\mathbf{N}^\mathrm{E} = \boldsymbol{\Gamma} f$ and $S^\mathrm{E} = S - S' - S''$. The chemical and thermal equilibrium conditions, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}' = \boldsymbol{\mu}''$ and $T = T' = T''$, are used here; it is not assumed that the pressure in both phases is equal, which is only the case for planar interfaces. However, p' and p'' are not necessarily different, and Eq. (19) is valid for both planar and curved interfaces.

Rowlinson and Widom[18] refer to Eq. (19) as the fundamental equation for A^E in terms of $\mathbf{N}^\mathrm{E}$, T, and f. This is justified, since an independent variation of these $\nu+2$ quantities is consistently possible. Accordingly, the surface tension is given by

$$\gamma = \left(\frac{\partial A^\mathrm{E}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^\mathrm{E},T}. \tag{20}$$

For a system without an interface ($f = 0$), there is no surface excess Helmholtz free energy ($A^{\mathrm{E}} = 0$) and no adsorption ($N_i^{\mathrm{E}} = 0$, for all components i). Hence, by integration at constant temperature, using the system with $f = 0$ as a reference state, Eq. (19) uniquely defines

$$A^{\mathrm{E}} = A^{\mathrm{E}}(\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}, T, f). \tag{21}$$

The definition of γ from Eq. (20) does not contradict the definition from Eq. (15). As we have shown, one can follow the procedure of Rowlinson and Widom[18] to transform Eq. (15) algebraically to Eq. (20). With this transformation, two thermodynamic degrees of freedom are eliminated, so that only $\nu + 2$ independent variables remain.

B. Specific surface excess free energy

The thermodynamic surface tension γ defined by Eq. (20) needs to be distinguished from the specific surface excess free energy $\bar{\gamma}$, defined here as

$$A = \boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N} - p'V' - p''V'' + \bar{\gamma}f. \tag{22}$$

For each of the two phases, $A = G - pV$ and $G = \boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}$, where G is the Gibbs free energy, so that the surface excess Helmholtz free energy from Eq. (11) is[18]

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\mathrm{E}} &= A - (\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}' - p'V' + \boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}'' - p''V'') \\ &= \boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}} + \bar{\gamma}f, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

assuming that the system is in thermodynamic equilibrium.

For scaling up from nanodispersed phases to macroscopic systems, it is important that A^{E} contains an adsorption contribution $\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}} = \boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}f$, cf. Rowlinson and Widom.[18] Unless a significant change of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ or $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ occurs, this term is roughly proportional to the surface area. It contributes to the surface tension γ, following Eq. (20), but not to the specific surface excess free energy $\bar{\gamma}$, following Eq. (23). This yields a deviation of $\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ between the interfacial quantities γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ which does not disappear even in the case of macroscopic systems; beside, further deviations beteen γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ may be present, which are, however, expected to decay in the limit $f \to \infty$.

Therefore, even for macroscopic interfaces, $\bar{\gamma} \approx \gamma$ only holds as long as the contribution to the surface excess Helmholtz free energy due to adsorption can be neglected. For planar interfaces, the Gibbs dividing surface can be positioned such that this term vanishes,[18] by imposing the condition $\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}} = 0$. For spherical interfaces, where the surface of tension is defined by the Laplace equation, cf. Eq (1), $\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}} \neq 0$ needs to be assumed. However, the surface excess $\Omega^{\mathrm{E}} = \Omega - \Omega' - \Omega''$ of the grand potential $\Omega = A - \boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}$ does not contain a contribution from adsorption, so that $\Omega^{\mathrm{E}} = \bar{\gamma}f$ remains valid by construction, even if significant adsorption occurs.[18]

Even though γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ may be different, they are related quantities which both characterize the contribution of the interface to the Helmholtz free energy of the system. Following Eqs. (20) and (23), the explicit relationship can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial f}\Big\{\boldsymbol{\mu}\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}} + \bar{\gamma}f\Big\}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T} \\ &= \mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T} + \bar{\gamma} + f\left(\frac{\partial \bar{\gamma}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

For spherical interfaces, in particular, a second-order curvature contribution to γ (proportional to $1/R_\gamma^2$ and, hence, to $1/f$) corresponds to a contribution to the free energy which is proportional to $\ln f$ and, hence, to $\ln R_\gamma$ and $\ln V'$. Accordingly, contributions to surface excess properties which scale with the logarithm of the size have been a recurrent topic of discussion in the literature on nanodispersed phases.[51–53]

C. Gibbs adsorption equation

Neglecting finite-size effects, the surface excess free energy is approximated by $\Omega^{\mathrm{E}} \approx \gamma f$, considering the grand potential Ω, in the derivation of the Gibbs adsorption equation following Rowlinson and Widom,[18] by $G^{\mathrm{E}} \approx \gamma f$, considering the Gibbs free energy G, as assumed by Alberty,[54] or $U^{\mathrm{E}} \approx \gamma f$, considering the internal energy U, following Marmur.[47] On this basis, Eq. (3) can be deduced algebraically.[17,18,47,50,54,55]

While such a simplification may be justified for macroscopic systems, it is not rigorous for small systems,[56] where, in general, significant finite-size effects can be present even for planar phase boundaries.[39,41,57,58] In particular, as discussed above, γ and $\bar{\gamma}$ cannot be assumed to be identical. It will be shown here that if the distinction between these two quantities is taken into account consistently, a different version of the Gibbs adsorption equation is obtained than the one employed by Tolman.[13]

The total differential of the Helmholtz free energy is obtained from Eq. (22) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}A = {} & \boldsymbol{\mu}\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N} + \mathbf{N}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\mu} - p'\,\mathrm{d}V' - V'\,\mathrm{d}p' \\ & - p''\,\mathrm{d}V'' - V''\,\mathrm{d}p'' + \bar{\gamma}\,\mathrm{d}f + f\,\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma}, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

which can be compared with the expression for $\mathrm{d}A$ from Eq. (16); subtracting Eq. (16) from Eq. (25) yields a Gibbs-Duhem like relation

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = {} & \mathbf{N}\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\mu} - V'\,\mathrm{d}p' - V''\,\mathrm{d}p'' + S\,\mathrm{d}T \\ & + (\bar{\gamma} - \gamma)\,\mathrm{d}f + f\,\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

for the whole system, and

$$0 = \mathbf{N}'\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\mu} - V'\,\mathrm{d}p' + S'\,\mathrm{d}T, \tag{27}$$

$$0 = \mathbf{N}''\,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\mu} - V''\,\mathrm{d}p'' + S''\,\mathrm{d}T, \tag{28}$$

for the two homogeneous reference systems without an interface, where all surface excess terms are absent. By subtracting the reference system contributions, i.e.,

Eq. (27) and Eq. (28), from the expression for the whole system, i.e., Eq. (26), a generalized version of the Gibbs adsorption equation is obtained:

$$0 = \mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}\,\mathbf{d\mu} + S^{\mathrm{E}}\,\mathrm{d}T + (\bar{\gamma}-\gamma)\,\mathrm{d}f + f\,\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma}. \tag{29}$$

Equivalently, in surface specific terms:

$$\mathbf{\Gamma}\,\mathbf{d\mu} + \zeta\,\mathrm{d}T + \mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} \;=\; \frac{\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}{f}\,\mathrm{d}f. \tag{30}$$

In particular, these relations between surface excess properties can be applied to dispersed phases at the nanometre length scale. In cases where the approximation $\bar{\gamma} \approx \gamma$ is legitimate, Eq. (30) reduces to the well-known version of the Gibbs adsorption equation,

$$\zeta\,\mathrm{d}T + \mathrm{d}\gamma = -\mathbf{\Gamma}\,\mathbf{d\mu}, \tag{31}$$

which corresponds to Eq. (3). In the case of variations where the surface area is not altered, corresponding to $\mathrm{d}f = 0$, Eq. (30) simplifies to

$$\zeta\,\mathrm{d}T + \mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} \;=\; -\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{d\mu}, \tag{32}$$

which despite the similar notation is different from Eq. (31), since $\bar{\gamma}$ is involved instead of γ.

If the surface area is not conserved during the change of Helmholtz free energy of the system, the complete form of the adsorption equation, as given by Eq. (30), must be employed. This includes the problem considered by Tolman[13] and in the present work: The size dependence of the surface tension of nanodispersed phases, such as nanodroplets or nanobubbles.

D. Tolman's law

We are now in a position to reexamine Tolman's law, based on the version of the Gibbs adsorption equation, Eq. (30), which takes into account the possible deviations between the surface tension γ and the specific surface excess free energy $\bar{\gamma}$. In terms of the set of thermodynamic degrees of freedom introduced for Eq. (19), i.e., $\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}$, T, and f, the total differential for $\bar{\gamma}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} = &\sum_{i=1}^{\nu}\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma}}{\partial N_i^{\mathrm{E}}}\right)_{N_{j\neq i}^{\mathrm{E}},T,f}\mathrm{d}N_i^{\mathrm{E}} \\ &+\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma}}{\partial T}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},f}\mathrm{d}T + \left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}\mathrm{d}f,\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where the third term can be obtained from Eqs. (24) and (30) as

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}\mathrm{d}f &= \frac{\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}{f}\mathrm{d}f \;-\; \mathbf{\Gamma}\left(\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}\mathrm{d}f \\ &= \mathbf{\Gamma}\left[\mathbf{d\mu} - \left(\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}\mathrm{d}f\right] \\ &\quad + \mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} + \zeta\,\mathrm{d}T,\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

and, by developing $\mathbf{d\mu}$ in $\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}$, T, and f,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{d\mu} - \left(\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}\mathrm{d}f = &\left(\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial T}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},f}\mathrm{d}T \\ &+\sum_{i=1}^{\nu}\left(\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial N_i^{\mathrm{E}}}\right)\mathrm{d}N_i^{\mathrm{E}}.\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Eq. (33) can then be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_i\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial N_i^{\mathrm{E}}}\right)_{N_{j\neq i}^{\mathrm{E}},T,f}\mathrm{d}N_i^{\mathrm{E}} \\ &\quad+\left[\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial T}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},f} + \zeta\right]\mathrm{d}T \;=\; 0.\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

All variations of the surface area cancel, and Eq. (36) becomes a statement on changes where f remains constant. At this point, it becomes impossible to continue, or to rectify, the derivation of Tolman's law as originally carried out by Tolman.[13]

For a transition with $\mathrm{d}f = 0$, the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{d\mu} \;=\; &\sum_i\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial N_i^{\mathrm{E}}}\right)_{N_{j\neq i}^{\mathrm{E}},T,f}\mathrm{d}N_i^{\mathrm{E}} \\ &+\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial T}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},f}\mathrm{d}T \\ &+\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial f}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},T}\mathrm{d}f,\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

in terms of the variables $\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}$, T, and f, simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{d\mu} \;=\; &\sum_i\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial N_i^{\mathrm{E}}}\right)_{N_{j\neq i}^{\mathrm{E}},T,f}\mathrm{d}N_i^{\mathrm{E}} \\ &+\left(\frac{\partial\bar{\gamma} + \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\partial\boldsymbol{\mu}}{\partial T}\right)_{\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}},f}\mathrm{d}T,\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

in terms of the variables $\mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{E}}$ and T. In his original derivation, Tolman[13] applied

$$(\mathrm{d}\gamma)_T = -(\Gamma\,\mathrm{d}\mu)_T, \tag{39}$$

while we find

$$(\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} \;+\; \mathbf{\Gamma}\,\mathbf{d\mu} \;+\; \zeta\,\mathrm{d}T)_f \;=\; 0, \tag{40}$$

which is obtained by combining Eqs. (36) and (38), and hence

$$(\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma})_{T,f} = -(\mathbf{\Gamma}\,\mathbf{d\mu})_{T,f}. \tag{41}$$

The subscripts T and f indicate that the identity in Eq. (41) only holds for changes that do not modify the temperature and the surface area. However, transitions with a constant value of f are not of interest for the problem considered by Tolman: For a droplet or a bubble, a constant surface area requires a constant radius, corresponding to a constant curvature of the interface and a constant volume of the dispersed phase.

By comparing Eqs. (39) and (41) it is apparent that the argument put forward by Tolman[13] is invalid. According to Eq. (39), the adsorption isotherm $\mathrm{d}\gamma = -\Gamma\,\mathrm{d}\mu$ can be applied to changes where f is modified, e.g., by varying the size of a nanodispersed droplet; this is the fundamental feature on which Tolman's deduction is based. However, Eq. (39) is incomplete. The isotherm $\mathrm{d}\bar{\gamma} = -\Gamma\,\mathrm{d}\mu$ applies to interfaces of pure fluids only as long as the surface area is constant, as in the case of a planar interface under appropriate boundary conditions. An assessment of the curvature dependence of the surface tension cannot be obtained from an analysis of the adsorption Γ or, equivalently, from the Tolman length $\delta = R_\rho - R_\gamma$ of nanodispersed phases.

III. DISCUSSION

As shown in the previous section, Tolman's law, stating that the curvature dependence of the surface tension is related to the difference between the Laplace radius and the equimolar radius, cf. Eqs. (4) and (9),

$$\lim_{R_\gamma\to\infty} \frac{1}{2\gamma_0}\left(\frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial(1/R_\gamma)}\right)_T = \lim_{R_\gamma\to\infty}(R_\gamma - R_\rho), \quad (42)$$

is not rigorously valid. Therefore, the first-order coefficient

$$c_1 = \lim_{R_\gamma\to\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma_0}\left(\frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial(1/R_\gamma)}\right)_T, \quad (43)$$

should be treated as a quantity which is unrelated to the planar limit of the Tolman length

$$\delta_0 = \lim_{R_\gamma\to\infty} \delta = \lim_{R_\gamma\to\infty}(R_\rho - R_\gamma). \quad (44)$$

Selected recent values obtained for c_1 are given in Tab. I for Lennard-Jones (LJ) and similar models. In Tab. II, recent findings for δ are shown for LJ or similar nanodispersed phases. From these values it can be seen that both c_1 and δ are very small, of the order of 0.1 to $0.5\,\sigma$ or even smaller, where σ is the size parameter of the corresponding model. For most models of low-molecular fluids, σ is of the order of 3 to 4 Å.[15,59–62]

Most recent studies report a positive coefficient $c_1 \approx 0.2\,\sigma$, cf. Tab. I and the corresponding literature sources.[20,22,23,26,28,63] This suggests that the first-order curvature correction increases the surface tension. It also suggests that this contribution is not very strong, and that it may be neglected except for very small droplets: Based on this effect only, a droplet with a radius of $20\,\sigma$ (i.e., typically, 7 to 8 nm) would have a surface tension which is 1% greater than that of the planar limit ($\gamma = 1.01\,\gamma_0$). For larger droplets, the deviation from γ_0 would be smaller than 1%.

Tolman[13] was aware of this, but he nonetheless proposed a truncation of the curvature expansion of γ after the first-order term. However, it is plausible that at this length scale, higher-order contributions to γ, e.g., proportional to $1/R_\gamma^2$ or $1/R_\gamma^3$, are already at least as significant as the first-order contribution.[12,23,28,37–39] It is therefore important to take such terms into account; otherwise it is impossible to assess whether $\gamma \to 0$ holds in the limit $R_\gamma \to 0$. Baidakov and Bobrov[23] and Wilhelmsen *et al.*[28]

T/T_c	$c_1^\star$	model	method	source
0.27	0.36	LJ	MD (cavitation)	[23, 26]
0.46	0.2	LJ	MD (cavitation)	[23, 26]
0.6	0.2	VdW EOS	compressibility	[63]
0.61	0.18	LJ	MD (cavitation)	[23, 26]
0.74	0.3	LJ + shielding	DFT	[20]
0.83	0.2	LJTS	MD	[20]
0.9	0.3	VdW EOS	compressibility	[63]
$\leq$ 0.92	0.16	LJTS	SGT	[28]
$\leq$ 0.92	0.2	LJ	SGT	[28]
$T \to T_\mathrm{c}$	0.4	LJ	SGT	[22]
$T \to T_\mathrm{c}$	0.3	LJTS	SGT	[22]

Table I. Literature values reported for the first-order coefficient in the curvature expansion of the surface tension, cf. Eq. (43), for the LJ fluid, the fluid described by the van der Waals equation of state (VdW EOS), the LJ fluid with a hard core (shielding), and the LJTS fluid with a cutoff radius of $r_\mathrm{c} = 2.5\,\sigma$, using molecular dynamics (MD) simulation, a thermodynamic approach based on the compressibility, density functional theory (DFT), and square gradient theory (SGT). The asterisk in $c_1^\star$ indicates normalization by the characteristic length scale of the corresponding molecular model, such as the LJ size parameter σ; cf. the cited references for details. The temperature is normalized by the critical temperature T_c of the molecular model.

$R_\gamma^\star$	$R_\rho^\star$	$\delta^\star$	T/T_c	model	method	source
$\approx$ 3	$\approx$ 3.7	0.7	0.78	LJTS–$2^{7/6}$	MC	[37]
$\approx$ 3.5	$\approx$ 4.2	0.7	0.78	LJTS–$2^{7/6}$	MC	[37]
$\approx$ 4.5	$\approx$ 5.1	0.6	0.78	LJTS–$2^{7/6}$	MC	[37]
4.52	3.96	−0.56	0.74	LJTS	MC	[25]
$\approx$ 5	$\approx$ 5.5	0.5	0.78	LJTS–$2^{7/6}$	MC	[37]
7.11	6.60	−0.51	0.74	LJTS	MC	[25]
16.32	16.22	−0.10	0.74	LJTS	MC	[25]
∞	∞	−0.04	0.74	LJTS	MC	[25]
∞	∞	−0.13	0.6 – 0.9	LJ	SGT	[64]
∞	∞	−0.13	0.78	LJTS–$2^{7/6}$	DFT	[37]

Table II. Literature values reported for the Tolman length of the LJ fluid as well as the LJTS fluid with a cutoff radius of $r_\mathrm{c} = 2.5\,\sigma$ (denoted by LJTS in the table) and $r_\mathrm{c} = 2^{7/6}\,\sigma$ (LJTS–$2^{7/6}$), using Monte Carlo (MC) simulation, square gradient theory (SGT), and density functional theory (DFT). The asterisks in $R_\gamma^\star$, $R_\rho^\star$, and $\delta^\star$ indicate normalization by the LJ size parameter σ. The temperature is normalized by the critical temperature T of the molecular model.

advocate the use of the Helfrich[65] expansion,

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 + \frac{c_1\gamma_0}{R_\gamma} + \frac{2\kappa + \tilde{\kappa}}{R_\gamma^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{R_\gamma^3}\right), \qquad (45)$$

where κ is the bending rigidity and $\tilde{\kappa}$ is the rigidity with respect to the Gaussian surface curvature $1/R_\gamma^2$. A truncation of this expression, or equivalently of Eq. (8), after the second-order term has been proposed on the basis of the Hadwiger[66] theorem which can be understood to imply the absence of a bending rigidity and of higher-order terms[67]

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 + \frac{c_1\gamma_0}{R_\gamma} + \frac{\tilde{\kappa}}{R_\gamma^2}. \qquad (46)$$

However, results on the hard-sphere fluid indicate that at least at high packing fractions, this interpretation of the Hadwiger theorem constitutes an oversimplification.[68–71]

IV. CONCLUSION

Care must be taken when concepts from macroscopic equilibrium thermodynamics are applied to small systems.[56] This also holds for relations which are well established, such as the Gibbs adsorption equation. It was discussed here how a deviation between the surface tension γ and the specific surface excess free energy $\bar{\gamma}$ affects this equation. A generalized Gibbs adsorption equation was derived which takes these effects consistently into account.

On this basis, for expansions of the type $\gamma/\gamma_0 = 1 + \sum_k c_k R_\gamma^{-k}$, we have shown that the coefficient c_1, which characterizes the influence of the surface curvature on the surface tension to first order in $1/R_\gamma$, cannot be determined from the Tolman length δ. As a consequence, the leading-order coefficient cannot be computed, e.g., by molecular simulation, comparing the equimolar radius R_ρ and the Laplace radius R_γ. This does not imply that the only way to obtain c_1 is from an analysis of numerical data for $\gamma(R_\gamma)$. Thermodynamic approaches can be employed to determine the coefficient from the compressibility of the fluid phases at equilibrium or from other related properties.[63,72,73]

However, since recent findings indicate that c_1 is very small or zero, and that the contribution to γ which is proportional to $1/R_\gamma$ is very small (and could even be entirely absent), such approaches will probably fail to capture $\gamma(R_\gamma)$ correctly. The challenge of developing rigorous thermodynamic approaches and simulation methods to quantify the higher-order curvature contributions to the surface tension of small bubbles and droplets therefore remains an important area of investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The co-authors from the University of Kaiserslautern would like to thank the German Research Foundation (DFG) for funding SFB 926, subproject A01, M. T. Horsch and J. K. Singh acknowledge support from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation within the CONNECT programme, G. Jackson acknowledges funding from the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) to the Molecular Systems Engineering group through grant nos. EP/E016340 and EP/J014958, and J. Vrabec acknlowledges funding from DFG within VR6/9–2. The authors thank D. Chandler, K. V. Cherevko, R. L. Davidchack, P. Horsch, C. Kuhn, G. V. Lau, E. A. Müller, D. Reguera López, and S. Werth for fruitful discussions. The present work was carried out under the auspices of the Boltzmann-Zuse Society for Computational Molecular Engineering (BZS).

REFERENCES

[1] A. Laaksonen, I. J. Ford, and M. Kulmala: 1994, 'Revised parametrization of the Dillmann-Meier theory of homogeneous nucleation'. *Phys. Rev. E* **49**, 5517–5524.
[2] P. G. Debenedetti: 1996, *Metastable Liquids: Concepts and Principles*. Princeton University Press.
[3] H. Vehkamäki: 2006, *Classical Nucleation Theory in Multicomponent Systems*. Heidelberg: Springer.
[4] A. V. Mokshin and B. N. Galimzyanov: 2012, 'Steady-state homogeneous nucleation and growth of water droplets: Extended numerical treatment'. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **116**, 11959–11967.
[5] S. Sumardiono and J. Fischer: 2007, 'Molecular simulations of droplet evaporation by heat transfer'. *Microfluid. Nanofluid.* **3**, 127–140.
[6] J. Liu, C. Zhu, X. Wang, T. Fu, Y. Ma, and H. Li: 2015, 'Three-dimensional numerical simulation of coalescence and interactions of multiple horizontal bubbles rising in shear-thinning fluids'. *AIChE J.* **61**, 3528–3546.
[7] Ø. Wilhelmsen, T. T. Trinh, S. Kjelstrup, and D. Bedeaux: 2015, 'Influence of curvature on the transfer coefficients for evaporation and condensation of Lennard-Jones fluid from square-gradient theory and non-equilibrium molecular dynamics'. *J. Phys. Chem. C* **119**, 8160–8173.
[8] J. Wedekind, G. Chkonia, J. Wölk, R. Strey, and D. Reguera: 2009, 'Crossover from nucleation to spinodal decomposition in a condensing vapor'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 114506.
[9] M. Horsch and H. Hasse: 2014, 'Molecular simulation of nanodispersed fluid phases'. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **107**, 235–244.
[10] M. T. Horsch, S. K. Miroshnichenko, J. Vrabec, C. W. Glass, C. Niethammer, M. F. Bernreuther, E. A. Müller, and G. Jackson: 2012, 'Static and dynamic properties of curved vapour-liquid interfaces by massively parallel molecular dynamics simulation'. In: C. Bischof, H.-G. Hegering, W. E. Nagel, and G. Wittum (eds.): *Competence in High Performance Computing*. Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 73–84.
[11] A. R. Nair and S. P. Sathian: 2014, 'Studies on the effect of curvature on the surface properties of nanodrops'. *J. Mol. Liq.* **195**, 248–254.
[12] A. Malijevský and G. Jackson: 2012, 'A perspective on the interfacial properties of nanoscopic liquid drops'. *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **24**, 464121.
[13] R. C. Tolman: 1949, 'The effect of droplet size on surface tension'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **17**, 333–337.
[14] J. G. Kirkwood and F. P. Buff: 1949, 'The statistical mechanical theory of surface tension'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **17**, 338–343.
[15] J. Vrabec, G. K. Kedia, G. Fuchs, and H. Hasse: 2006, 'Comprehensive study on vapour-liquid coexistence of the truncated and shifted Lennard-Jones fluid including planar and spherical interface properties'. *Mol. Phys.* **104**, 1509–1527.

[16] A. Tröster and K. Binder: 2011, 'Positive Tolman length in a lattice gas with three-body interactions'. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 265701.

[17] J. W. Gibbs: 1878, 'On the equilibrium of heterogeneous substances'. *Transact. Connecticut Acad. Arts Sci.* **3**, 343–524.

[18] J. S. Rowlinson and B. Widom: 1982, *Molecular Theory of Capillarity, Chapter 2*. Oxford: Clarendon.

[19] M. J. P. Nijmeijer, C. Bruin, A. B. van Woerkom, A. F. Bakker, and J. M. J. van Leeuwen: 1991, 'Molecular dynamics of the surface tension of a drop'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 565–576.

[20] A. E. van Giessen and E. M. Blokhuis: 2009, 'Direct determination of the Tolman length from the bulk pressures of liquid drops via molecular dynamics simulations'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 164705.

[21] M. Horsch, H. Hasse, A. K. Shchekin, A. Agarwal, S. Eckelsbach, J. Vrabec, E. A. Müller, and G. Jackson: 2012, 'Excess equimolar radius of liquid drops'. *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 031605.

[22] E. M. Blokhuis and A. E. van Giessen: 2013, 'Density functional theory of a curved liquid-vapour interface: Evaluation of the rigidity constants'. *J. Phys.: Cond. Mat.* **25**, 225003.

[23] V. G. Baidakov and K. S. Bobrov: 2014, 'Spontaneous cavitation in a Lennard-Jones liquid at negative pressures'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **140**, 184506.

[24] M. H. Factorovich, V. Molinero, and D. A. Scherlis: 2014, 'Vapor pressure of water nanodroplets'. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **136**, 4508–4514.

[25] A.-A. Homman, E. Bourasseau, G. Stoltz, P. Malfreyt, L. Strafella, and A. Ghoufi: 2014, 'Surface tension of spherical drops from surface of tension'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **140**, 034110.

[26] V. G. Baidakov: 2015, 'Surface tension of cavitation pockets according to data of computer simulation of nucleation in a stretched fluid'. *Colloid J.* **77**, 119–124.

[27] G. V. Lau, P. A. Hunt, E. A. Müller, G. Jackson, and I. J. Ford: 2015, 'Water droplet excess free energy determined by cluster mitosis using guided molecular dynamics'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **143**, 244709.

[28] Ø. Wilhelmsen, D. Bedeaux, and D. Reguera: 2015, 'Tolman length and rigidity constants of the Lennard-Jones fluid'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **142**, 064706.

[29] Ø. Wilhelmsen, D. Bedeaux, and D. Reguera: 2015, 'Tolman length and rigidity constants of water and their role in nucleation'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **142**, 171103.

[30] N. Bruot and F. Caupin: 2016, 'Curvature dependence of the liquid-vapor surface tension beyond the Tolman approximation'. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 056102.

[31] K. V. Cherevko, L. A. Bulavin, L. L. Jenkovszky, V. M. Sysoev, and F.-S. Zhang: 2015, 'Evaluation of the curvature-correction term from the equation of state of nuclear matter'. *Phys. Rev. C* **90**, 017303.

[32] K. V. Cherevko, L. A. Bulavin, L. L. Jenkovszky, V. M. Sysoev, and F.-S. Zhang: 2015, 'Curvature correction term as a constraint for the Skyrme interaction'. *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 014308.

[33] M. Schrader, P. Virnau, D. Winter, T. Zykova-Timan, and K. Binder: 2009, 'Methods to extract interfacial free energies of flat and curved interfaces from computer simulations'. *Eur. Phys. J. Spec. Top.* **177**, 103–127.

[34] B. J. Block, S. K. Das, M. Oettel, P. Virnau, and K. Binder: 2010, 'Curvature dependence of surface free energy of liquid drops and bubbles: A simulation study'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **133**, 154702.

[35] S. K. Das and K. Binder: 2011, 'Thermodynamic properties of a symmetrical binary mixture in the coexistence region'. *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 061607.

[36] S. K. Das and K. Binder: 2011, 'Universal critical behavior of curvature-dependent interfacial tension'. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 235702.

[37] A. Tröster, M. Oettel, B. Block, P. Virnau, and K. Binder: 2012, 'Numerical approaches to determine the interface tension of curved interfaces from free energy calculations'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **136**, 064709.

[38] A. Ghoufi and P. Malfreyt: 2011, 'Local pressure components and surface tension of spherical interfaces. Thermodynamic versus mechanical definitions. I – A mesoscale modeling of droplets'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **135**, 104105.

[39] S. Werth, S. V. Lishchuk, M. Horsch, and H. Hasse: 2013, 'The influence of the liquid slab thickness on the planar vapor-liquid interfacial tension'. *Phys. A* **392**, 2359–2367.

[40] G. Filippini, E. Bourasseau, A. Ghoufi, F. Goujon, and P. Malfreyt: 2014, 'Slab thickness dependence of the surface tension: Toward a criterion of liquid sheets stability'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **141**, 081103.

[41] F. Schmitz, P. Virnau, and K. Binder: 2014, 'Determination of the origin and magnitude of logarithmic finite-size effects on interfacial tension: Role of interfacial fluctuations and domain breathing'. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 125701.

[42] E. Bourasseau, P. Malfreyt, and A. Ghoufi: 2015, 'Surface tension and long range corrections of cylindrical interfaces'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **143**, 234708.

[43] G. V. Lau, I. J. Ford, P. A. Hunt, E. A. Müller, and G. Jackson: 2015, 'Surface thermodynamics of planar, cylindrical and spherical vapour-liquid interfaces'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **142**, 114701.

[44] T. L. Hill: 1951, 'On Gibbs' theory of surface tension'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **19**, 1203.

[45] T. L. Hill: 1952, 'Statistical thermodynamics of the transition region between two phases. I. Thermodynamics and quasi-thermodynamics'. *J. Phys. Chem.* **56**, 526–531.

[46] A. Ghoufi, P. Malfreyt, and D. J. Tildesley: 2016, 'Computer modelling of the surface tension of the gas-liquid and liquid-liquid interface'. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **45**, 1387–1409.

[47] A. Marmur: 2015, 'Surface tension and adsorption without a dividing surface'. *Langmuir* **31**, 12653–12657.

[48] G. J. Gloor, G. Jackson, F. J. Blas, and E. de Miguel: 2005, 'Test-area simulation method for the direct determination of the interfacial tension of systems with continuous or discontinuous potentials'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, 134703.

[49] J. G. Sampayo, A. Malijevský, E. A. Müller, E. de Miguel, and G. Jackson: 2010, 'Evidence for the role of fluctuations in the thermodynamics of nanoscale drops and the implications in computations of the surface tension'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **132**, 141101.

[50] T. Frolov and Y. Mishin: 2015, 'Phases, phase equilibria, and phase rules in low-dimensional systems'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **143**, 044706.

[51] M. P. A. Fisher and M. Wortis: 1984, 'Curvature corrections to the surface tension of fluid drops: Landau theory and a scaling hypothesis'. *Phys. Rev. B* **29**, 6252–6260.

[52] A. Dillmann and G. E. A. Meier: 1991, 'A refined droplet approach to the problem of homogeneous nucleation from the vapor phase'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **94**, 3872–3884.

[53] S. Prestipino, A. Laio, and E. Tosatti: 2012, 'Systematic improvement of classical nucleation theory'. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 225701.

[54] R. A. Alberty: 1995, 'On the derivation of the Gibbs adsorption equation'. *Langmuir* **11**, 3598–3600.

[55] C. J. Radke: 2015, 'Gibbs adsorption equation for planar fluid-fluid interfaces: Invariant formalism'. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **222**, 600–614.

[56] T. L. Hill: 1964, *Thermodynamics of Small Systems*. New York: W. A. Benjamin.

[57] M. P. Gelfand and M. E. Fisher: 1990, 'Finite-size effects in fluid interfaces'. *Phys. A* **166**, 1–74.

[58] T. Peng, Q. Li, J. Chen, and X. Gao: 2016, 'Quantitative analysis of surface tension of liquid nano-film with thickness: Two stage stability mechanism, molecular dynamics and thermodynamics approach'. *Phys. A* **462**, 1018–1028.

[59] W. A. Steele: 1978, 'The interaction of rare gas atoms with graphitized carbon black'. *J. Phys. Chem.* **82**, 817–821.

[60] J. Vrabec, J. Stoll, and H. Hasse: 2001, 'A set of molecular models for symmetric quadrupolar fluids'. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **105**, 12126–12133.

[61] I. Nezbeda: 2005, 'Towards a unified view of fluids'. *Mol. Phys.* **103**, 59–76.
[62] P. Ungerer, C. Nieto-Draghi, B. Rousseau, G. Ahunbay, and V. Lachet: 2007, 'Molecular simulation of the thermophysical properties of fluids: From understanding toward quantitative predictions'. *J. Mol. Liq.* **134**, 71–89.
[63] E. M. Blokhuis and J. Kuipers: 2006, 'Thermodynamic expressions for the Tolman length'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **124**, 074701.
[64] V. G. Baidakov: 2016, 'Spontaneous cavitation in a Lennard-Jones liquid: Molecular dynamics simulation and the van der Waals-Cahn-Hilliard gradient theory'. *J. Chem. Phys.* **144**, 074502.
[65] W. Helfrich: 1973, 'Elastic properties of lipid bilayers: Theory and possible experiments'. *Z. Naturforsch. C* **28**, 693–703.
[66] H. Hadwiger: 1957, *Vorlesungen über Inhalt, Oberfläche und Isoperimetrie*. Berlin: Springer.
[67] P.-M. König, R. Roth, and K. R. Mecke: 2004, 'Morphological thermodynamics of fluids: Shape dependence of free energies'. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 160601.
[68] P. Bryk, R. Roth, K. R. Mecke, and S. Dietrich: 2003, 'Hard-sphere fluids in contact with curved substrates'. *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 031602.
[69] B. B. Laird, A. Hunter, and R. L. Davidchack: 2012, 'Interfacial free energy of a hard-sphere fluid in contact with curved hard surfaces'. *Phys. Rev. E* **86**, 060602R.
[70] E. M. Blokhuis: 2013, 'Existence of a bending rigidity for a hard-sphere liquid near a curved hard wall: Validity of the Hadwiger theorem'. *Phys. Rev. E* **87**, 022401.
[71] I. Urrutia: 2014, 'Bending rigidity and higher-order curvature terms for the hard-sphere fluid near a curved wall'. *Phy. Rev. E* **89**, 032122.
[72] L. S. Bartell: 2001, 'Tolman's δ, surface curvature, compressibility effects, and the free energy of drops'. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **105**, 11615–11618.
[73] O. S. Marchuk and V. M. Sysoev: 2003, 'Influence of the drops size on the coefficient of surface tension in a wide range of pressures and temperatures along the coexistence curve'. *J. Mol. Liq.* **105**, 121–125.